

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 BONN 13675 01 OF 02 221330Z

47

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EURE-00 CU-02 NRC-05 ERDE-00 ERDA-05

CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01

PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06

TRSE-00 NSC-05 ACDA-05 /091 W  
----- 030988

P R 221313Z AUG 75

FM AMEMBASSY BONN

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2326

INFO USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS PRIORITY

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE

CINC EUR VAIHINGEN

CINC USAREUR HEIDELBERG

CINC USAFE RAMSTEIN

USLO SACLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 BONN 13675

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MPOL, NATO, CSCE, PARM, PFOR

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS: PRELIMINARY FRG THINKING ON  
REFORGER OBSERVERS

SUMMARY: THE FONOFF HAS OFFERED PRELIMINARY VIEWS  
ON THE VARIOUS QUESTIONS INVOLVED IN THE REFORGER  
OBSERVER ISSUE AS FOLLOWS. OBSERVERS WOULD BE  
DRAWN FROM EMBASSY STAFF MEMBERS ACCREDITED IN BONN.  
WP COUNTRIES THAT MIGHT BE INVITED INCLUDE THE USSR,  
ROMANIA (BULGARIA) AND POLAND. NEUTRALS MIGHT BE  
YUGOSLAVIA, AUSTRIA (SWITZERLAND) AND SWEDEN. NATO  
ALLIES WOULD NOT BE FORMALLY INVITED TO SEND OBSERVERS.  
FINALLY, QUESTIONS SUCH AS THE HANDLING OF OBSERVERS,  
LENGTH OF THEIR STAY, PORTION OF MANEUVER TO BE VIEWED,  
NON-DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT, ETC., MIGHT BEST BE  
CONSIDERED BY US/FRG MILITARY REPS. END SUMMARY.  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 BONN 13675 01 OF 02 221330Z

1. FRG FONOFF MBFR DIRECTOR RUTH, WHO IS ALSO RESPON-

SIBLE FOR CBMS, INVITED EMBASSY OFFICER FOR A DISCUSSION ON AUG. 21 TO BEGIN WHAT HE CALLED THE "FRG-US DIALOGUE" ON THE QUESTION OF INVITING OBSERVERS TO REFORGER. RUTH BASED HIS REMARKS ON HANDWRITTEN NOTES, AND HE EMPHASIZED THAT HIS COMMENTS REPRESENTED PRELIMINARY THINKING ON SOME OF THE QUESTIONS INVOLVED.

2. REGARDING WHICH GOVERNMENT SHOULD DO THE INVITING, RUTH SAID IT WAS OBVIOUS IT WOULD BE EITHER THE FRG, THE US OR BOTH TOGETHER. HE DID NOT EXPRESS A PREFERENCE FOR ANY ALTERNATIVE.

3. ON THE QUESTION OF WHERE TO SEND THE INVITATIONS, RUTH'S INCLINATION IS TO NOTIFY THOSE COUNTRIES INVITED THROUGH THEIR EMBASSIES IN BONN.

4. AS FOR THE TYPE OF PEOPLE TO BE INVITED, RUTH THINKS THEY SHOULD BE EMBASSY STAFF MEMBERS ALREADY ACCREDITED TO THE FRG. THIS WOULD NEATLY SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF THE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF OBSERVERS, SINCE THEY WOULD ALREADY HAVE BEEN PROVIDED FOR. THE DECISION AS TO WHICH STAFF MEMBERS TO DESIGNATE AS OBSERVERS WOULD BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH EMBASSY. COMMENT: EMBOFF POINTED OUT THAT WP NATIONS REPRESENTED IN BONN DID NOT HAVE MILITARY ATTACHES AND PERFORCE WOULD HAVE TO DESIGNATE CIVILIAN OBSERVERS. THIS DID NOT SEEM TO BOTHER RUTH. HOWEVER, HE DID NOT FORECLOSE THE POSSIBILITY OF HAVING MILITARY REPS FROM WP CAPITALS-ACCEPTED AS OBSERVERS. END COMMENT.

5. REGARDING THE COUNTRIES TO BE INVITED FOR REFORGER, RUTH'S FEELING IS THAT THE SOVIET UNION SHOULD BE INCLUDED THE FIRST TIME. HE THINKS THE IDEA OF INVITING THREE WARSAW PACT STATES IS A REASONABLE ONE. HE THOUGHT CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO INVITING THE USSR, ROMANIA (OR BULGARIA WITH THE ROMANIANS HAVING PREFERENCE), AND ONE WP STATE WITHIN THE NGA

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 BONN 13675 02 OF 02 221330Z

47

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EURE-00 CU-02 NRC-05 ERDE-00 ERDA-05

CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01

PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06

TRSE-00 NSC-05 ACDA-05 /091 W

----- 030998

P R 221313Z AUG 75

FM AMEMBASSY BONN

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2327

INFO USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS PRIORITY

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE

CINC EUR VAIHINGEN

CINC USAREUR HEIDELBERG

CINC USAF RAMSTEIN

USLO SACLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 02 BONN 13675

-RUTH'S INCLINATION WOULD BE TO NAME POLAND) AS FOR THE NEUTRAL STATES, RUTH EXPRESSED THE BELIEF THAT FIVE OF THEM COULD BE ELIMINATED BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT MILITARILY RELEVANT TO THE CBM ISSUE, CITING SAN MARINO AND THE VATICAN AS EXAMPLES. OF THE REMAINING NEUTRALS, THE FIRST THREE STATES THAT CAME TO MIND WERE YUGOSLAVIA, AUSTRIA (OR SWITZERLAND), AND SWEDEN. RUTH DID NOT FEEL THAT FELLOW NATO STATES HAD TO BE FORMALLY INVITED. INSTEAD, THEY COULD SEND OBSERVERS TO ANY NATO MANEUVER AS DESIRED.

6. RUTH SAID FURTHER THAT THE HANDLING OF OBSERVERS WOULD DEPEND UPON THE NATURE OF THE MANEUVER. HE THOUGHT IT WOULD BE BEST IF US/FRG MILITARY REPS WERE TO DISCUSS THIS ASPECT OF THE PROBLEM. HE AGREED WITH EMBOFF'S COMMENT THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO BLATANT DISCRIMINATION AMONG VISITORS FROM WARSAW PACT, NEUTRAL OR CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 BONN 13675 02 OF 02 221330Z

NATO NATIONS. RUTH SAID THIS SHOULD BE HANDLED BY THE MILITARY IN THE FIELD TO MAKE SURE THAT VISITORS WERE TREATED IN AS NON-DISCRIMINATORY A MANNER AS POSSIBLE.

7. REGARDING THE LENGTH OF TIME OBSERVERS SHOULD REMAIN, RUTH FELT IT WOULD BE BEST AGAIN IF MILITARY REPS WERE TO MAKE AN INPUT ON THIS PROBLEM. HE WAS NOT CERTAIN WHETHER THE WHOLE MANEUVER OR ONLY A PORTION OF IT SHOULD BE VIEWED. IF THE DECISION IS TO PERMIT OBSERVERS FOR ONLY A PORTION, THEN IT WOULD HAVE TO BE DECIDED WHICH PORTION WOULD BE MOST AP-

PROPRIATE.

8. ONE FINAL THOUGHT THAT RUTH HAD, WHICH HE DID NOT RELATE TO REFORGER, IS THAT THE WEST SHOULD TAKE CARE THAT RECIPROCAL SOVIET INVITATIONS, WHEN EXTENDED, SHOULD NOT JUST BE LIMITED TO THE SOVIET 250 KM BORDER NOTIFICATION ZONE. WESTERN OBSERVERS SHOULD ALSO BE PERMITTED TO VIEW MANEUVERS HELD DEEPER WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION.

9. RUTH SAID HE WOULD APPRECIATE RECEIVING WASHINGTON REACTION TO THESE PRELIMINARY IDEAS.  
CASH

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** COMMITTEE MEETINGS, MILITARY POLICIES, MEETING OBSERVERS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 22 AUG 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975BONN13675  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750291-0365  
**From:** BONN  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750824/aaaaauqh.tel  
**Line Count:** 182  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 21 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <21 APR 2003 by CunninFX>; APPROVED <22 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CSCE/CBMS: PRELIMINARY FRG THINKING ON  
**TAGS:** MPOL, PARM, PFOR, GE, NATO, CSCE  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006